

### **REMARKS**

Claim 23 has been amended. New claims 31 to 34 have been added. Claims 1 to 22; 24 to 27; 29; and 30 have been previously canceled.

Claims 23; 28; and 31 to 34 remain in the application. Of these, claims 23 and 32 are independent method claims. Claims 28 and 31 are dependent upon independent claim 23. Claims 33 and 34 are dependent upon independent claim 32. Claims 28/31 and 33/34 contain parallel subject matter.

As amended, both independent claims 23 and 32 define a method comprising identifying an aorta having an aneurysm and a neck region proximal to the aneurysm and adjacent a renal artery. As amended, both independent claims 23 and 32 define providing a first prosthesis comprising a first trunk including a prosthetic material and a scaffold that supports the prosthetic material to define a lumen within the first trunk. In both independent claims, the first trunk is defined as being sized and configured for placement in the neck region to provide reinforcement to the neck region. As defined in both independent claims, the first trunk includes a reinforced proximal region (deployed closest to the head), a reinforced distal region, and an intermediate region between the proximal reinforced region and the distal reinforced region. Claims 23 and 32 differ in that, in claim 23, the prosthetic material of the reinforced proximal region and the reinforced distal region is defined as being more dense than the prosthetic material of the intermediate region to reinforce the reinforced proximal region and the reinforced distal region – whereas in claim 32, the scaffold of the reinforced proximal region and the reinforced distal region is defined as being more dense than the scaffold of the intermediate region to reinforce the reinforced proximal region and the reinforced distal region.

Other than the foregoing difference, independent claims 23 and 32 are the same. Both define providing a second prosthesis comprising a second trunk including a prosthetic material and a scaffold that supports the prosthetic material to define a lumen within the second trunk. The second trunk is sized and configured for placement in the aneurysm to bridge the aneurysm. The second trunk includes a proximal region and a distal region.

Both independent claims 23 and 32 define providing at least one tissue-piercing fastener, and providing an intraluminal fastener attachment assembly that can be manipulated to implant the at least one tissue-piercing fastener into tissue. Both independent claims 23 and 32 define deploying

the first prosthesis in the neck region with the reinforced proximal region placed adjacent a renal artery and the reinforced distal region placed adjacent the aneurysm, and deploying the second prosthesis in the aneurysm. Both independent claims 23 and 32 define telescopically fitting the reinforced distal region of the first trunk and the proximal region of the second trunk to form a composite prosthesis, the reinforced distal region of the first trunk resisting migration of the second trunk. Both independent claims define manipulating the intraluminal fastener attachment assembly to implant the at least one tissue-piercing fastener into tissue through the reinforced proximal region of the first trunk to anchor the composite prosthesis, the tissue-piercing fastener being retained in the reinforced proximal region of the first trunk.

The claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon Parodi et al (WO 00/16701) in view of Taheri et al. (US 5,591,195) and Pinchuk (US 5,855,598). Neither Parodi nor Taheri nor Pinchuk teaches or suggests a composite prosthesis formed between first and second prosthesis, in which the first prosthesis is sized and configured for placement in a neck region proximal to an aneurysm and adjacent a renal artery, and includes a reinforced proximal region – formed either by a more dense prosthetic material (claim 23) or by a more dense scaffold (claim 32) than in an intermediate region of the prosthesis – to receive at least one tissue-piercing fastener, the tissue-piercing fastener being retained in the reinforced proximal region of the first prosthesis. Neither Parodi nor Taheri nor Pinchuk teaches or suggests a composite prosthesis formed between first and second prosthesis, in which the first prosthesis (sized and configured for placement in a neck region) further includes a reinforced distal region – formed either by a more dense prosthetic material (claim 23) or by a more dense scaffold (claim 32) than in an intermediate region of the prosthesis – to be telescopically fitted to a proximal region of the second prosthesis (which is sized and configured for placement in the aneurysm to bridge the aneurysm), the reinforced distal region of the first prosthesis resisting migration of the second prosthesis.

For these reasons, applicant believes that Claims 23; 28; and 31 to 34 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that questions or matters of clarification remain, applicant believes that such matters can be handled expeditiously by an interview by telephone to advance prosecution of this case, and the applicant is committed to proceed on that basis.

Respectfully Submitted,

By



Daniel D. Ryan

Registration No. 29,243

RYAN KROMHOLZ & MANION, S.C.

Post Office Box 26618

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53226

(262) 783 - 1300

Customer No.: 26308